

M 1234

Group III, Wednesday Lunch

August 9, 1967

Who is new today? Someone, two people came in.

X Unclear word.

Yeh. How come, almost I would say?

X We were told about it in the book shop.

In the book shop?

X The book shop. ~~Which one? Huh?~~

Which one? Huh?

X (Unclear word) Street book shop.

What was the name of the book shop?

X (Unclear word) street book shop.

(Unclear phrase). Do you know the number? (Unclear phrase)...

Washington square. Huh? No. (unclear phrase). Isn't that (unclear word) also down there?

X Yes. Maybe there was a poster in the window.

Of what?

X Maybe there was a poster....

Now maybe. Is there or not? No, your fantasy. Anyhow, what they think?

X I wasn't told...

X I'd been asking for a book (unclear phrase). Some people had approached me and asked if I was interested in hearing lectures (unclear phrase).

Mr. N. Some people were in the book store?

X Yeh.

They mentioned, you don't know their names, do you?

X No.

It's always interesting you know for me to trace it to see where this and that comes. It is like trickling of water. Go to the most unexpected places. But anyhow here you are. Now what do you

expect?

X I had read the book on...by Ouspensky.

Did you ever read anything of Gurdjieff? Did you ever read anything of Gurdjieff? Did you ever read anything? Close the door. Oh, the windows. We better stop all this.

X Unclear phrase.

Oh, yes.

X Unclear phrase.

Did you read in Search of the Miraculous?

X Yes.

And that stimulated you to try to find something about Gurdjieff?

X Also for clarification.

Yes. Now, who else was new. I saw a finger up. Ah, gradually. It's not my custom, you know, to ask all the time because we usually start right off and it's a question you come and you take pot luck. If you don't like it you don't come back. What questions are there today that we could talk about? Who has been thinking about...

Ah. No flying saucers.

X No.

That is taboo. ~~Alright~~

X Alright.

Good.

Um, this comes from a conversation last night with Tom.

Tom who?

X Wasmuth. Um, um about the, what is the difference between transmigration of souls and reincarnation? As I understand it, in the Hindu tradition transmigration is their thesis, with Buddha it's reincarnation and there is a difference and I never really thought about this.

When it is a soul it has already reached a certain degree of development. When it is reincarnation it may not have reached a soul or a very small part. So that the idea of reincarnation is simply to find a place where it can perfect itself up to the point of becoming a soul. If it is a soul it has more freedom to move and the transmigration of a soul simply means that it then finds opportunities where it can adapt itself to conditions to which it has not been used. So both have to do with a possible further development but one is at one place and the other a little bit further along. That's the only difference. To the extent that anyone, any particular entity wishing reincarnation, to what extent their soul already has developed, it goes without saying that as soon as one develops anything that becomes spiritually interested in further development there has to be a beginning of a soul. But usually what is meant if a soul is indicated by an octave that what is do, re, mi still belongs to the possibility of having to, to reincarnate. What is already sol, la, si is a soul more or less full-fledged, at least permanent and no chance of reverting anymore to its original state. So the transmigration belongs to that kind of a (unclear word). Yeh, Tom, you agree?

Tom Wasmuth I wouldn't disagree with that, no.

It is alright. Even if you did you would have a fight on your hands, wouldn't you?

X I'm sure I would. I have no information about it though.

Well, as long as the information you get seems logical then there is a chance for you to have a place in your brain and some day maybe it will come out. What other things are there of general life.

You know I don't want to go too far in... Yeh? Yeh?

Jessica
Block:

Um, When I've tried to talk to people about the group or about the ideas of Gurdjieff, I find myself talking like a parrot. I believe what I say but I haven't experienced it and I feel that it's not right of me to talk that way and yet I don't know how else to express it.

MR.N:

Why do you have to express it? If it bothers you to be a parrot then don't be one. Who compels you or tells you that you have to say something? You see, that has to come from some particular place. It has, naturally it has to be based on a desire, sometimes to communicate, sometimes simply to relate that what affects you and you think it's worth while and sometimes it may be because the person who hears it might profit by what you are saying. And it's a little different degree of emphasis but it is quite a different kind of a thing from what sometimes, if I want to talk just for the sake of talking I don't care anymore if I'm a parrot, because I'm not concerned with who hears it. If there is a certain reason why I want to talk to other people, then of course I incur an obligation that that what I'm saying has to be convincing enough. Now it can be convincing to the extent that another person hears what is being said and then perhaps, because of that kind of a knowledge that's formulated, might have an affect on their brain and sometimes the way it is said even if it is a parrot, may be a very good imitation. So if the result is that the other person starts to think or even feel or becomes a little more interested in wanting to continue with it, you have, you might say, done your duty. For yourself, of course, it's not an easy task because if you hear

yourself functioning as a parrot, and you would like to function as a human being who has words of their own and not necessarily that what is copied from a parrot, ^t then your problem is quite different. Because if you actually want to tell something that comes from your own experience you have to find your own language, ^A and although it may be stimulated by what the parrot has said, that what starts in you is a certain form of life, finally ending up in wishing to communicate but certainly in the terminology that belongs to you. Whenever anything is original it has to be created. One is always affected by the ~~xx~~ different factors that have entered into you before, which have stimulated you and it cannot be helped because that was really the cause that one originally became interested. You cannot rely on something that is within you and appears all of a sudden full-grown. The stimulus must come from outside, and particularly when it is affecting you in such a way and maybe whatever is the emotion that goes with it, that then you start to imitate a little bit because it seems as if that is the easiest way to do it. And I think for yourself it's quite right in order to learn how to formulate. Even if you use terminology that belongs to someone else, at least you use your voice in order to be heard by someone else and it's very much the same as the person who wants to create and is ~~a~~ an artist uses certain forms that already have been used before and then simply in using it acquires a technique. So that is all it will give. If you play piano, let's say, and you have been stuffed full of all kinds of melodies - Mozart and Beethoven, and now you try to improvise, before you know it your fingers are doing something that Mozart already has done and nice little melody that out of your youth you remembered and you used to

play and this and that and whatever sentimentalities may be involved in it, there all of a sudden in the improvisation you hear certain notes that are very familiar to you and it turns out to be copying. And I don't think - there is no objection to it, but it is not the purpose for why one really wants to compose, or why you want to improvise. Improvisation means that you have to find a language of your own and whenever you want to formulate something based on your experience, it has to be in that what you feel, and then, even stammering, express in words which remain your own. ^AAnd although some of the words may be reminiscent of someone else who has used them, and particularly when it becomes a little professional so that you would have to use certain terminology, otherwise you would not be understood, that at such a time that arrangement of certain words in certain sentences belongs entirely to you. And that creates for you a style, and, this style of saying certain things in a certain way, when it remains your own, you can then start using it by putting in different kind of, let's say, energies which belong to you in a certain way that you regulate. For instance you may say a sentence in one way and you can say it in quite a different way by changing the tone of your voice or letting certain silences occur and getting hold of ~~yourself~~ ^{yourself}, catch your breath, take a deep breath, emphasize this and all the rest of the paraphernalia which belong to a certain way, partly let's say acting, in regard to some one else and then it is not only what you say but ^{it is} the expression on your face, the seriousness, the intent, the inability to find the right word, the nicety for yourself to find that you can be exact and that you have definitely the ~~other~~ ^{other} person in mind because you

want to convey something for the benefit of the other and all that (unclear phrase). In order to develop a language for yourself you have to start very, very simple in the beginning. Just use one or two words about which you are sure and that could be based on an experience of your own and avoid all reference to being a parrot. As soon as you catchx yourself bite your tongue. Don't do it. Get out of it. If you play and it becomes Mozart, stop. It's not you if your aim is to be you. It depends on the aim. There are many people who are very good, let's call it, germ carriers. They use a certain form which is partly familiar to others in trying to have, let's say, a contagious disease go from one place to another. A mosquito is a marvelous germ carrier if malaria is a desirable state to be in. Of course it isn't in that case but, if you are a germ carrier of ideas and philosophy, of something that has to do with objectivity and a better way of life or at least more of an insight into what you really are, it doesn't really matter at all if you're a germ carrier by means of parrot or that you are original and actually can convince a person in that way. \$ I wouldn't worry too much about it. I think it will gradually come. Whatever you do you keep on practicing, gradually it will be something that will be your own experience and you will find words, I say stammering, maybe, in the beginning but you will find without any question the words that really will convey for you what is the truth instead of having to use the formulations of someone else. So whatever is the motivation in wanting to talk, don't bite off too big a piece and don't expect that you already can have a whole oration in your own language. Maybe some time, maybe not now. Yah? We'll go around

the circle, huh? Okay. Yah.

X Mr. Nyland.

Dick, yes.

X I'd like to know how we can apply the rule that Gurdjieff's grandmother, I think it was, told him on her death bed not to do as others do. How can you apply it?

X Yes.

By doing what the grandmother said.

X But Gurdjieff also says...

Yeh.

X ...When you are among wolves ^{you must} howl like the wolves.

Ah, that's right.

X Now...

That is another way of doing the things that you are not used to.

X But don't we do that sort of normally?

Oh, I think we do, more or less. But if you want to paint the town red, you don't. It all depends on the state in which you are.

Sometimes the way you are you feel you have to conform to whatever is the rest of the world and you do as the Romans do and usually it is because you have fear that if you be a little bit unromantic that then perhaps because of that they will criticize you. So if you don't like that and you don't like to have an argument or a fight on your hands or having to explain yourself, you keep quiet, you shut up at the proper time, and you look at someone to see at what moment you have to laugh. One becomes part of that little group, as a little society, and you just howl with the wolves. At other times when there is a certain form of life in you that needs

an expression, and it is pretty strong, and you feel that it has to explode if you don't do something about it. You really start to care less and less about who's around. It all depends, then, on the intensity of that which you think is right, and sometimes you burn your fingers, because you do it at the wrong time, and then, of course, you get into hot water and they will criticize you then for that reason, and then of course you feel perhaps a little ashamed and the next time you say I ought to keep my mouth shut. It varies a great deal depending entirely on what is your realization of life in you that you wish to express or not express and then you find if it is really something that you feel you are compelled to express that you find the proper situation in which it can be done. If you want to sing and really singing means something for you but it is horror to someone else who listens to it, of course, you're not going to sing there in the living room with your family but you wait 'till you get to the bathroom. You understand what I mean. It is simply something that is determined by the way you wish to be. Now the question, if that what you now wish to express is different from your usual form of behavior it will give you the possibility of acquiring a new kind of a dexterity and the reason why Gurdjieff or his grandmother, his mother or whatever, talked about that, don't do like others do is simply that sometimes it's very useful not to conform to other people and if you want to catch a ball and someone catches it this way that then sometimes you have to bend over and catch it as if you are bending forward and it is back of you, it simply means that I want to use my body the way I am, the way my personality is and has grown up not in a stereotyped,

clichéd manner. And the reason is in the first place to become more adaptable and the second place, that that because it is different will give me an opportunity to see myself in a different way and then without criticizing myself since I know I did it for a definite reason so I don't want to criticize unless it is not in accordance with what I set out to do but when I'm successful in doing something that is different that then because of that I am reminded of the real reason why I wished to acquire (unclear phrase) and that has to be associated with my desire to wake up. So you see that is fundamentally at the basis of it that when I want to disagree with someone it gives me a chance for me to be awake. Not necessarily that that what I have to do I have to continue to do and that in itself is much better than that what I have been doing but when I have been doing things in an ordinary, automatic, mechanical kind of a way then I've fallen asleep with it and that sometimes that form of behavior is quite habitual that at that time I have absolutely no chance to wake up at all because I don't even think about it and even in that kind of a sleeping state I don't dream about the possibility of being awake. You understand now. It is always in relation to the possibility of becoming conscious and when that enters then it has a value. When that doesn't enter and it is just a form of behavior in ordinary life it has very little value. It might, at most, give you a little bit more dexterity. Okay?

X

Okay.

Fine. I can't see your face so I don't know the expression on it. Come Mark, sit down. Robert. Other questions. Ya. Oh, no, you were first. Ya.

X I want two questions about a woman.

Who?

X About a woman, about women. The first is; are women as fit for this work as men? Is there some impediment, (unclear phrase) a very special nature?

HRN You think they are impediments in (unclear phrase) only they are woman, that's all. They are human beings. They have brains, they have feelings, sometimes a little extra and they have a body. Now what would be wrong for a woman to use this kind of work for further development? What would be the impediment?

X I guess I was asking if she could go as far.

Ah, but that's another question.

X Yes.

How far do you want her to go? Full development of all three bodies. The answer is yes. That she can. Under what conditions, that's a difficult question because I think that in woman as well as in man there is something that is not entirely total human being and that is the reason that there is a division between man and woman and that there is a possibility for man and woman to make one whole which is not possible even if a man by himself develops all he can develop into and the same applies to a woman. So if there is an impediment in a woman there is also one in a man which can be mutually dissolved if they know what kind of a relationship is necessary for that kind of unity. So that is a line of work when it has to do with a development of a Keshdjanian or an Emotional body or when it has to do with a development of soul that then the relationship between man and woman are on that basis as far as work is concerned and that the unity then can be intellectually, it can

be emotionally and it can be physically. But at the present time that we are bound a great deal by the physical and although it may be instigated by a little bit of a feeling that the emphasis and usually the point of gravity is on the physical only, it's just too bad for both man and woman and at times when that remains the emphasis that then they are in their own way and that becomes their impediment that they cannot go further because the accent remains where it should not remain. It can be there in the beginning but it should lead to something else because that what is of more value to any kind of a person, man or woman, is not their body. It may be already noticed by themselves that their emotions if they are pure enough are of course far superior as far as quality is concerned and that that what could be their brain could actually become something quite unusual in relation to the physical body but that at the present time in an unconscious state, the accent is still too much physical and that, in regard, when physical and brain are compared that the physical is positive and the brain is negative that really it should be reversed and that in the growth of man in evolution the accent should be on his brain as positive and the body as a negative force without ever neglecting any one of the three. So that when a woman thinks that she is inferior or has some trouble that she could not reach she can in the proper conditions also with the proper man. And if that you might say gets stuck at times on the physical scale and then prevents them from developing anything that is of a higher nature it all depends on the circumstances and their original wish why they even might have a love affair or get married. You see it all depends on that kind of a condition but this applies to the man as well as the woman and that in a man

or a woman there is a relationship in which they are not entirely equal but that sometimes the man has something that the woman hasn't got, an intellectual development or a way of approach or a way of positivity and a woman has something that is also a force but we call it a negative one because the other is positive and that perhaps emotionally she's further developed partly because she has intuition and partly because she has something that is much of a wider range as far as emotional capacities are concerned and then they fulfill each other or equip or help each other to become one together and that either one by themselves never can reach that kind of unity. That happens to be the condition on earth. It's not the condition that is always there and it is not the condition for conscious people and it's not the condition in the spiritual world but it happens to be on earth because we live here under the influence of two forces and as I say it happens to be on earth because earth happens to be in that kind of a place it is where there is definitely a balance between the negative and the positive force and this is caused by the moon. The moon has a relationship of creating for man a negativity as representing a positivity in reflecting the lights of the Sun and because of that kind of a condition which exists cosmologically, mankind starts to exist in the same way, because they are part of organic kingdom, and ^{what} ~~and~~ happens to the totality also happens to the individuals. Don't worry about it. I would never consider it. I would almost say this: that if that is the law I'll prove the law to be wrong. I never would be hampered. I never would say, oh, somebody else is going to be president of the United States. If I have ambition for that I don't care what someone else will tell me that I cannot do it. I will go

M 1234

ahead and do it anyhow. As far as the woman and a man is concerned a woman has to find out what she is and of course what she's capable of and so does a man and there are many reasons why a man will not grow out at all. Simply the fact that he's a man has no particular meaning. It only means he has a certain place and so has a woman; that they belong together and can together reach something that individually they cannot reach of course it's without question but I don't reach anything unless there is something that I also create outside of myself which then you might say starts to attract me and pulling me up. Otherwise I always remain on earth. I have to project something outside of me I call God and then I ask God to pull me up to heaven. But after all, it is up to me to create that kind of a god, because, if I don't create it, I can live very well without having any concept of god ever existing. I can even deny the existence of my spiritual life. I need not pay any attention to any what we might call ethical thoughts. I can become, absolutely, without any question, practically ninety-nine percent, maybe not a hundred, physical ~~may~~ body. I can become that kind of a let's call it, an animal, but in any event, even if it walks around in wolf's clothing, still will remain a human being. As I say don't worry. Just go ahead. The field and the road is way open. It takes a very long time before you realize that perhaps there are limitations of that kind. But there are many, many limitations already immediately when you start, and that is of immediate concern. As soon as you start to work, there is already an obstacle in the form of ordinary nature, belonging to earth which objects to you waking up. There are of course statements in All and Everything about the particular

CAPS

striving of women and men - Keschapmartian beings - and that the limitations belongs to a female, and a female is not complete unless there is a male, but the reverse is true; a ~~x~~ male is not complete unless there is a female. Now, for ~~these~~ those who don't have either a female or a male, they have a very hard time. For them there is a very special reason why, it is difficult, because sometimes that what could be between man and woman would be a natural way which will help them to overbridge certain difficulties that someone without either one or the other sex will have to do for himself. At the same time it's a matter of creation in one as an individual so that then at times that what appears outside as a creation can fulfill that what would be the reality of actually something existing. But that's a different kind of a subject. Under any normal kind of a condition it does not apply. When it's a little abnormal it has difficulties, but it has no objection to it, because those are also human beings, and all human beings have the possibility of growing. Several, of course, will not grow, because they don't want to, or, they cannot or, too many obstacles, and that, therefore of those who have been called, few will be chosen. But, again, I don't want to consider the fact that I am not chosen, because who ~~and~~ would tell me that I am not? If my father and mother tell me you shouldn't do that, because this and that is not right, and you should not grow up to be a doctor or something, naturally, I will have an opposition to that, because I say, they, what do they know? I belong to this enlightened generation, and they are old-fashioned and Victorian, and why should I take their word? Oh, no, I go ahead - I will bump my head against the wall, and I will find out, and, probably, I will find out the hard way, and maybe after a little

while I'll say, well, my father was right. And maybe I say, ~~hmm~~ hmm, I proved him to be wrong. And then, so what? The motivations of a man are his own, and he finds out what he can find out. And in forming whatever he considers for himself the truth, or a motivation that is the road he takes. If after experiences, he finds out that it's a detour, he ~~has~~ has only himself to blame. It's much better that way, because if he falls off the precipice let him fall. Why shouldn't he? That may be one way for him to find out the road to eternity. What other questions? Yeah.

X I have a question about this idea of taking impressions. I don't - I don't think I understand it - I'm not sure - um, the last three weeks - for the last three weeks on Sunday I've been going different places and just trying to be in - in a different place - like, the first time I went and watched a softball game, and the uh second time I went to the Museum of Modern Art and then this Sunday I went to a park in my neighborhood and listened to a concert, and there were a lot a people around me - I had to stand in the middle of a lot of people in the sun - I couldn't move around or sit down or anything. This was for about, oh, maybe three hours, and then after that I walked over and I listened to, uh, some people chanting Hare Krishna, the, uh, Hindu chant, and I watched them for a while, I sat down with them, and then, uh, they got up to leave, and they were rolling their rug up and putting everything away, and, uh, there was one of the people kept singing when everyone else had stopped, and uh, something struck me when I ~~saw~~ saw that, because I realized that he was singing really only from himself, just because he felt the joy of, of doing that. I felt somehow I felt the same

way, that we were both feeling the same way, and, uh, then everyone left, and I was just there alone, sitting, sitting on the grass. But my question is, it seems to me, anyway, that it doesn't really matter where you are, as long as you - your awareness is at a certain state, that almost anything as long as it is vivid and new in some way is an impression. Am I correct in - in assuming that?

Mr. N. If the difficulty is in trying to wake up that then you become dependent on the surroundings and you become dependent on what you are, unconsciously, it is always then a question of how much energy goes in one direction or the other, so there is no question about the fact that if I want to wake up that certain conditions are far better than others. The more I am involved, the more energy will be taken up for whatever purpose. If I am involved and I like this or that or it is new - curiosity satisfied - and I go and simply expose myself to a variety of different impressions, they will take me, and, of course, I remain, then, bound to them, and that what is now affecting me is also to be digested and all of that will require further attention as an energy which I have, and I spend that time, energy, and whatever intensity there is on that kind of a digestion. Now, if I want to wake up, I have to have a certain wish for that and the wish has to come, again, from whatever motivations but at least the wish has to be translated into the ~~xxx~~ actuality of actually experiencing that what it is to be awake. When that happens to be in a surrounding which is already a little chaotic or very busy or requires a lot of energy and there is a little then, less energy less for my wish, I don't fulfill my wish. All I have is the wish. The proper way, particularly if

I'm in the beginning trying to develop something that I don't possess at all because I know I'm not objective and I know that I cannot really look at myself impartially at all and I don't know anything in the beginning about what is meant by a moment of living and for that reason, it being very difficult to develop this kind of dexterity that I will want to select the conditions which are most conducive and I would be a ~~fool~~ fool if I try it in conditions where I know I cannot do it anyhow although it is interesting to spend a little time and to see if one can and then get a slap in the face because I know I can't and maybe it disheartens one and you get a little embarrassed or really you loose a particular form of interest in yourself and maybe you get too discouraged. I wouldn't run that risk. I would simply try to wake up only at times when there is a real chance and when you think of it and out of the different moments of the day you select those where you think you will have most success. Now it's good to get all these impressions of this and that, and thoughts, and it remains unconscious and it is interesting but no more. It simply gives you perhaps a few data that afterwards that might be useful in the form of work of trying to understand certain things or a least have the possibility of finding a word but you see it has nothing to do with being awake.

X In other words impression can only be used by someone who is awake...
Mr. N. No, impressions go on all the time. Your five sense organs receive impressions all the time. It has to be used; if they are not there, you're not alive. If you cut out all impressions, you're reduced to a lump of flesh. Impressions form at the present time the best kind of food for a man and if that is removed from him he is not

alive at all. He may be a little breathing kind of a creature if there is enough of that kind of force still to make his lungs work and when the lungs work maybe there is a little blood circulation and perhaps there is some kind of a feeding and a distribution of food that he gets by means of air or by means of some solid or liquid food but impressions, it's very difficult even to imagine a person without impressions. And impressions, I think, are so absolutely, much more necessary than air. So don't try to do away with them. You can't, it's impossible. If you close your eyes your ears go on but there are certain things that definitely take place without even your knowledge and your sense organs will continue to function. So it is not a question of eliminating them. It's a question of reducing them so that they don't have as much to say and that you don't have to give as much attention to them. The relaxation ~~process~~ process either of your body or your feeling or your intellectual center will reduce you as a human being to the lowest possible existence. Nevertheless, he exists and is still an object for being observed and all the I needs is the fact of you existing and the registration of that fact. No more. Alright?

X Yeh, if I, well, how about this. Should I keep doing this on Sundays or should I...

Oh, do it, but wake up as much as you can and you will find out you can't, don't get discouraged and then use the energy for wishing to wake up at the times when you can.

X Yeh.

Much better. Yeh.

X Uh, this thing occurred today which I would call a kind of trust that's been developing, ah, in the I, however small it may be

even when I don't see it which isn't that it's there...

Now wait a minute. We're now talking about the I we talk about in Gurdjieffian terms?

X Yes.

Yeh, is that what you mean. And you have the trust in that little I hoping to grow up? Now how do you know it exists when you don't see it or don't know it?

X That you know it's trying to come back.

No, (unclear phrase) not there if it's going to come back. Either it exists or it doesn't. The thought of it existing has no meaning whatsoever. I at the only time when it does exist you have an experience that you know it does. And you know that unconsciously even that something exists outside of you or is functioning as if outside which is recording that what you are but in order to have the experience of I existing I has to be sufficiently grown up to have some means of communicating it's own existence to you. And that's a long time. At most at certain times you can become in this what is personality aware of an effort you make unconsciously to bring about the existence of something that could function consciously. But that's all. And only when you make that effort you can be sure and you hope of course that the little I exists and if that effort is not there and you have gone over into a feeling or a thought the I does not exist for you. If it continues to exist and if there is a screen or a cloud in between so that you say yes it is behind a cloud it has no meaning because you cannot even profit by it. You know you don't profit by the sun when there are clouds. There is a little difused but you don't get enough heat and you can say, yes, the sun exists sure, you hope it will, the same way as I exist when I fall asleep at night that I will wake up

in the morning and of course you draw the conclusion that you have existed but you were not aware in any sense of the word. It is just an assumption and very idiotic that there and you find yourself there again in bed and nothing. I remember when I was very young I couldn't believe that the night was as long as it was and figuring it out on the watch that if I had to go to bed at ~~9:00~~ 9:00 o'clock and I woke up at 7:00 that was a ~~whole~~ whole day in time and I couldn't believe it. You see, if I say God exists it's fine if I can trace it and if there is some kind of a sign that I know he talks to me, but usually it is a one way street. Of course, I send my prayers up to heaven and I hope they will reach him and then when they get there that God can even listen to them or that I happen to speak that language or that at that time when they arrive that he's not too busy but all of this is just imagining. You see if it is said in that way or if it is explained that way, now it is different if there is something that belongs to me, to myself, my inner life that I would call my God and then I say that what is the highest or the most beautiful thing within me, my sacred, the essence of essence or whatever it is that is the most pure. That I can, you might say, create or believe in and at times I can experience it and when it is there I say it exists. When it is, I do not experience the existing I can say I hope it will exist again. When it exists again I draw the conclusion that it has existed but not based on an experience, it's based on the thought that it must have been in existence because it was there, it is now there, therefore it has remained in existence but it has no meaning. It only has a meaning when there is the actuality of something that

at that time influences me so that it has a voice of a certain kind for me which I can hear or listen to and that there is then established a relationship. When the relationship is not there as being accepted as a relationship, retained by that what I send it only becomes from me a sending out of something towards now in the direction where I hope it might be received but I don't get a return. You see if I send a registered letter with something and I want an answer then I know it has been ~~xxxx~~ received and many times if I pray to God and then afterwards I look for a sign that my prayer has been heard I very anxiously interpret everything as a result of my prayer and I say, you see, God helped me but it is nonsense. You remember a little ~~xx~~ story of the kittens, this was a, happened to be a Christian Scientist and in the family there were four little kittens and unfortunately the eyes were closed and so they knew that God was good and that matter didn't exist and that love would prevail and he kept this thought for nine days and sure there the little eyes were opened. You see, it is that kind of thing of an interpretation of something that it comes from God and this happened to be just nature so what assurance do I have for that kind of a spiritual existence within myself and I think I have to be very careful even to assume that the little I already has that kind of a (word ?) that it starts to affect me and direct me. The little I takes a long time to grow and it has to grow in conditions that are not at all conducive and it has to be done by me wishing very seriously and fervently and intelligently and almost I would say continuously trying to feed it, trying to create it and recreate it and make it be there because I wish it to be there and I wish

it to grow but what is it up against, my whole life, my whole unconscious life prevents it. That what I am unconsciously with the atmosphere that I create around me and all the thoughts, everything that are my manifestations, everything that I do, the subjective world and in that subjective world this little I is born. It took Jesus 30 years before he dared to teach. And it's a long time. And look at the equipment he had. Already when he was twelve years old he was in the temple. The little I is as yet not in the temple at all. It is just a little bit trying to do it's best almost I would say to open it's own little eyes to see what is this world. That is the attention that I give it in the beginning and that with all the best intentions on my part that that little I cannot grow over night and Rome was not built in one day. Maybe years, maybe with a miracle over night in such intensity that I'm destroyed, that I could exist, surely all such things can happen but in the usual case it will not happen because we are not always in the way of a miracle occurring to us, we're just ordinary little human beings trying to get along. At the same time the desire that one wishes to have for wanting this I to exist, it can be so honest and so sincere and sometimes that can produce in me as if it exists and that then my behavior is under the influence of the as if existing which has nothing to do with the reality but nevertheless produces in me a psychological state as if that I'm encouraged to continue. There's no objection to assume that something exists which my better knowledge will tell me doesn't exist. For me it becomes an aim. I (unclear phrase) whenever I have an aim, I do as if it already exists and is, you might say, is beckoning me to come. That's the

picture of God outside but when I want to become on speaking terms I have to put him inside of me and say, now, now you're my own. For this you're my God and I don't let you go away until you have blessed me. That's the proper attitude and when he can create that almost I would say he wouldn't care about the little I because the little I is there growing. You see I only object to a little, almost a glib way of saying little I, it doesn't and don't have hallucinations. One is a earnest human being trying to find a way and every time when you try to find it in the correct way as much as you know of that then at that time you also know that to the extent that that kind of an intensity to that extent the friction is higher and it becomes more and more difficult even the more high you will go because it has to overcome the difficulties inherent in one as a personality which are almost rusted in and have to be taken out because one doesn't want to give them up. These are the difficulties, in the beginning, curiosity is very satisfying because it's a lovely adventure and after that has worn off and work on oneself becomes a little monotonous then what will I do. That is really where work starts. When I sail with the wind I think it's me but it is the wind. But when I sail against it, then it is my tacking that will do it and I utilize the wind even if it's opposed. Man is born to overcome difficulties. As soon as there is something in man that is easy and oily, smooth he is not working, he is asleep and he remains then completely a subject to his unconsciousness because he doesn't even know it, he doesn't know he is going because something is taking him. When you go with the wind you have nothing to measure by. Alright? Be careful. Because one has to be quite honest with ~~oneself~~ oneself. It is so foolish to believe in something that has

no value. After a little while the props are taken away and then you're much more lost. Keep your feet on the ground. It is right. Walk with your, your mind in the clouds if you like all kind of possible visions, and create with that whatever you think ought to be created in order to give you an aim and feed it with as much wish, your emotion, your feeling as much as you can, it's a little lower but at least it is a force, but always step by step your foot on the ground planting it down on earth, on earth, that's where we are. We're not as yet in another kind of a region; we haven't left this world yet and we're not angels even if we sometimes may act a little angelic or that sometimes we say how spiritual such a person can become. No, we're just ordinary little bit human beings eating and drinking and sleeping and we need it because you try to go without it and you will see where you land. This ought to be sufficient fact for oneself that I cannot get rid of that what is my body. It's not that I want to but at least I cannot deny it. It has to have certain requirements that is fulfilled. With that, okay, I can exist if I allow my body to continue to exist; simply because the body exists it must remain in existence until it has fulfilled it's functions and at the same time supply the I with an object. These are the two reasons why man should remain on earth until I is strong enough to carry him to a different level of being. Any other questions? Yeh.

X If essence is the condition of childhood innocence the consciousness manifests in an essential reaction to an impression, an ~~(xxxxxx)~~ external impression as opposed to a personal reaction...

No. Does your essence exist at the present time.

X Excuse me.

Does your essence exist at the present time?

X Yes. Now, that's the essential question: is that essence a constant phenomenon?

No.

X It isn't?

It changes. You, you just said yourself when you were a little child you first, you might say, identify that with the existence of essence implying as if it didn't exist now. Your essence changes all the time.

X You're, you're attunement with that essence...

No, what is your essence?

X The essence is a constant state. How can the essence...

That's what you say. I say it doesn't. What is, is for you? Essence? Something that is a little bit more toward the interior. What's the difference between essence and surface?

X Essence and surface?

Surface. Yeh. I mean that's the...

X Surface is appearance and essence is reality.

Oh, no, not at all. It depends on what plane you are. The reality of yourself as a body, as a matter, is that reality or not?

X ...one level of reality...

Yeh, sure reality of (word ?). I mean, I call that reality.

X That, that is a reality that is open to change.

But everything is open to change including essence. That's what I'm telling you. Why should it remain...huh? Yeh, go ahead.

X I was under the impression that, ah, there was a change (unclear phrase). That is the essence that I was referring to, an essence that is the substratum of change itself.

You have to define essence. What is essence in you? ~~Huh~~

X Constant.

Huh?

X Constant.

No, essence is essence. Then you say it is confident and I say no.

X No, I didn't say confident, I said constant.

Constant.

X Yes.

Of what. Constant.

X Constant. The state of being constant.

But are you? What is constant, in life? Everything in life is changeable, it's ephemeral. It is subject to a law of decay. What is there that is permanent in life?

X Change, change is permanent.

No, that is a little philosophical question, because the change is not even permanent. The change is subject to change.

X Is it subject...

Yes, of course.

X But isn't it subject to itself.

Naturally but why dwell on these kind of, let's say how many angels go on the top of a pin.

X No, no because it's a question of clarity.

The clarity is you. In yourself. And I ask you what is your essence. Nothing could be clearer than using yourself as an instrument of observation.

X The state of being in which consciousness is synonomous....

And what is your consciousness?

X That...

At the present time.

X At the present time it is a condition of fractured personality.

Mr. N. Okay. Let's say it is a mental functioning. Yeh, you agree?

X Yeh.

It is something that takes place in your head and that produces at times thoughts and sometimes the thoughts produce words. And sometimes the thoughts produce a concept and sometimes in the mind there is a comparison between two kind of thoughts and one is a little heavier than the other, a little bit more meaningful than the other. So I say that is a form of pondering and it belongs also to the mental functioning of myself and the totality of all that activity I call my conscious state, useful for living on earth. Right?

X Uh, huh.

Even if it has ideas of heaven, it is still being used mostly for getting around on the street and not to be killed by a car or to become very creative and sometimes as an inventor or to follow pursuits of science or having all kinds of things that I afterwards put in a book and publish. Whatever it may be, it is still ordinary mental functioning. Right? Now what is essence because that is the ordinary consciousness, you see there is nothing unusual about it. Everybody has it.

X Essence is ~~xxxx~~ ordinary consciousness...

No, no, no, no. We were talking about the mental functioning that is a state of consciousness for each person and everybody has a certain form of consciousness, some a little more, some a little less, some brighter, not as bright, some quick, slow, whatever it is the condition. Alright? What is essence in you?

X Well, I, the question raises itself in my referring to what I, what I call an absolute essence or what I refer to as a relative essence.

That's good, as long as you define it. What is it? Because it's no use having a word...

X The absolute essence is what we went through before but the relative essence is...

Now, wait a minute. What did we go through before?

X The reciprocal causality.

Huh? You know I don't unde#stand those terms at all.

X We were just talking about change subject to change.

Yes.

X Change subject to itself, change being a concept.

Yes, now what has that to do with absolute essence?

X Well, it being the essence of...

No, it isn't. Not at all. It's only a gradation. A little more or a little less and that is what essence is, a little more or a little less. If essence could be defined as being a littlex deeper than that what is peripheral. You understand.

X Could you repeat that. I didn't...

...peripheral, the surface of your living. Superficiality. Ordinary talk, talk, talk is quite superficial. It is ~~xxx~~ skin deep. But that what is inside of me is flesh where the organs are, which start to function and some of them are buried sufficiently deep to be protected and I consider them essential for my living and very often I say that what is not easily produced or that what is not shown to the outside nevertheless remains functioning and I consider it an essential activity. My heart, for instance, is very essential to the fact of my living but a pinprick that causes a little blood to come out of my finger is very superficial. In exactly the same way that what I experience in ordinary life, and that I digest by

means of sense organs or otherwise may create in me a very superficial impression and digested superficially. I say sometimes it doesn't touch me or it doesn't concern me and at other times I say this really hits me or this goes straight to my heart or this is essentially, I feel it, I know it, something is stirred in me and I say it must reach me deeper and in that sense then I experience something that is way away from my surface exterior and it becomes more and more my interior life. Now I ask you, what is your essence? Is it that kind of a form of essence and we don't talk about absolute essence because we don't know anything about it. That what is really essential...Huh?

X Relative essence then would be that...

Yeh, but you haven't got it.

X No, no I didn't...

No, don't let's philosophize about the things you haven't got. Simply...

X Yeh, yeh but the question I was leading to, ^{this} in terms of the previous question, previous to that about receiving external impressions, now in terms of self-remembering what would...

You don't understand self-remembering.

~~X~~ X No, I don't.

No, so then don't use the word. Use only what you know. Otherwise you're a parrot. We talked about that, it's no use. You see when you have read certain things out of Ouspensky of course you're liable to repeat but have no content. It's what Gurdjieff calls verbal language, just words, words, words against root language which means words with content. So one is interested in the content, the meaning, not in the words. A word is a form. That what you pour into it is essence. The depth. When you have color,

vibration rate is just superficial as color and we know the distinctions between different colors. That what is the depth of a color it is chroma, it's the intensity and there's quite a difference between colors even if they're the same color. It will make a different kind of an impression on one. A tone on a piano when you strike it forcefully is a different kind of a tone than just when it is being touched because in the first place when it is struck forcefully it has many overtones whereas if it is struck just lightly it only is that particular little tone. And so you can apply it to a variety of different ways of how either human beings manifest themselves or whatever they say, do, feel, act, it doesn't matter. It's all subject to this same law of intensity and the intensity is the totality of the volume in depth, not over a distance, if you understand that. I don't know if you understand it. The mass times that what is the volume of movement but we won't go into that because that belongs to philosophy. Your essence is what you really are. That is it has for you more value than that what is superficial. It is not as yet a question does it really exist because you don't know and if you go from the skin down towards the center you don't know where essence starts and you don't know where the skin stops because that what is underneath the skin is still subject to the skin and there is no sharp distinction in any kind of a thought for yourself or of your life that you can separate it out and say this is where superficiality stops and now is where my essence begins. Your body or that what are your thoughts or that what you are yourself whenever you want to ^{consider} ~~consider~~ the question of essence and superficiality is very much like an onion which you peel or an artichoke. When you peel an onion you come to the inside and there

is a core, but you don't know where the core is. All you know is it is more essential and the essence is simply in existence because you know something that is superficial. You say this is less and less and less superficial therefore it must become more and more essential but you don't know at what particular layer of the onion you go over into essence. It ~~does~~ doesn't exist. It's a very slow, gradual process. So you see when you talk about essence you really don't know what you're talking about and nobody does. It's not that I accuse you of not knowing. Yeh?

X In, ah, in that, ah, in the Search of the Miraculous Ouspensky referred to it as that childhood condition, or that condition before one has been conditioned...

Sure. At that time... one is less conditioned.

X (unclear phrase). Now...

Yes, that's right. It is much more on the surface.

X Is that, is that surface...

It is more on the surface. No, it is what the child is essentially. And there is very little of surface developed and there is surely very little of an identification with that what becomes manifestation. It is uninhibited. The inhibitions are my manifestations to the outside world. The uninhibited means it doesn't exist. It is like an atmosphere that becomes gradually formed. When I'm without an atmosphere I'm essentially more alive. I'm much more vulnerable and I'm much more alive. A child is free because it is not as yet so-called full-grown. Nothing is written on it for particular sociological results. A child is much more true to itself and that what is really essence in the form of life. But you see if I go from ~~from~~ surface to essence, to essential essence the end is a point.

That is the center of my world, my universe if you like and I say the more essential the closer I come to my God if he actually is in that kind of a state of my point of existence because I endow, that is what is the concept of God. It's exactly the same as ~~x~~ when I say these are the properties of a point. But you have to be very clear about that because, you're not and don't take what Ouspensky says; of course a child is a child. That is why it is a child and thank ~~and~~ ^{God} we all were and too bad we all are not, if at the present time we could be like little children as it says in the Bible we would be uninhibited and we would have a chance to live essentially and because of that would be a little closer to God and understanding of how to (unclear phrase) life. It would be marvelous but we lose ourselves completely in the surface of our living, in the multiplicity of our manifestations and all the little so-called impressions which we take in through sense organs which remain constantly from now until doomsday subjective.

X Well, if I, if I may venture to use the term self-remembering which you said I shouldn't use...

Yeh, then you would mention it and use it.

X Yeh. Yeh.

Why do you wait?

X I introduced it.

Yeh, if you want to know but...

X I wonder if this would be, or if this possibly is an accepted means of self-remembering and that is observing the...

Observing will lead you to self-remembering. Remembering yourself depends how you write self. Capital S or a small s. If it's a capital S, that is what really essentially is you as a child. If

you could remember that it would be wonderful.

X But in terms of the external impressions coming in and one reacting to these external impressions by simply living in a state of being or attempting a state of being...

You see you use terminology for which you have absolutely no concept.

X (Unclear phrase).

Yeh, no that's not you, that is another person.

X Yeh.

Whatever there was with that other person...

X ...that raised a question in my mind...

Yeh, that may be but now you're using it.

X Yeh.

You don't know what being is.

X Well, I, I sympathize with...

No, that may be, nice and kind. No, no, no, no.

X I (unclear phrase).

Yeh, but you were talking your word. You're talking the words that you want to use like impressions, it's alright, reacting perhaps I can let that go but as soon as you talk about being you don't know what it is.

X So, I shouldn't use the word.

I don't know. You want to use it without content, it's okay. But you can never make yourself understood because that what is the impression that you have of it and that what is your concept and what you understand by it may not be the same as someone else.

X Well, that's understood from the beginning...

Yeh, good, then why communicate?

X For, the, for the sake of expanding the word itself.

No, the question is do you want to communicate. If you don't want to communicate why talk? Or talk by yourself. The fact that you want to say something surely must have a meaning, meaning, that you want to reach someone. You can talk to yourself, it's all right, and you can go sing in the woods if you want. It's quite all right, there's no objection to it but this way it's different because you start to use words that you hope will be understood by someone else in the same way as you mean it. And they will not know what you're talking about because they have, of course, their own interpretation. Until one establishes among a variety of people that what is a common language that each person can ~~understand~~ understand. Any kind of scientific research has to be understood in the terminology of that what one is investigating and if I say boiling point I have to make sure that someone else understands the same thing by boiling point as what I use. When I say thermometer it is something that is useful as a tool in science. And everybody who's using it must know what is meant so when I use the word being it has to be defined. When I use self-remembering it has to be understood. This is the, the necessity of exact language, language which is absolutely an essential for anything that belongs to a possible development on the basis of recording that what are experiences. I have difficulty of an ~~xxxxxx~~ experience since I am a human being and naturally experiences in my subjective way and the difficulty enters when I try to put it in words for someone else. The experience remains my own and I can interpret any way I like but when I want to communicate it to someone else or to help him or to convince him I have to use words that he understands and I have to use them correctly. Keep on thinking a little bit but don't quote too much

from Ouspensky and don't take too much of what Ouspensky has said as if you understand it. That what you will understand is work on ~~yourself~~ yourself, if you start, if you know how and you use the word observation, you don't even know what is meant. If you come back again we'll talk a little bit about what is really work and if you like the ~~x~~ essence of work. Let's leave it. See you next week I hope. Good-bye everybody.

End